DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 438 445 CE 079 753

TITLE	The Learning and Skills Sector: The Emerging Agenda. FEDA Comments.
INSTITUTION	Further Education Development Agency, London (England).
ISBN	ISBN-1-85338-532-8
PUB DATE	2000-00-00
NOTE	13p.
AVAILABLE FROM	FEDA Publications, Citadel Place, Tinworth Street, London SE11 5EH, United Kingdom. For full text: http://www.feda.ac.uk.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adolescents; Adult Education; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Planning; Federal Aid; Foreign Countries; Partnerships in Education; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; Program Implementation; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Great Britain; Proposed Legislation

ABSTRACT

Britain's new Learning and Skills Bill focuses on learners', not providers', interests. The Learning and Skills Council (LSC) opens up funding for voluntary and community bodies, and organizations from outside education, and has a duty to encourage employers to participate in the provision of post-16 education and training. Local education agencies (LEAs) may establish and maintain secondary schools that provide full-time education only for 16-19 year-olds. The role of local learning partnerships is strengthened, a welcome development given their potential for reflecting the needs of the local community. The bill restricts the power of further education corporations to set up companies for the purpose of providing education or training. Although local authorities have a greater strategic influence over post-16 learning in their local areas, the bill makes it clear that in relation to adult and community education, LEAs are required to secure provision specified by the LSC. LSCs' responsibilities mark a significant shift toward more area-based planning and higher quality. A model gives them the role of assessing needs, generating a plan to meet them, and contracting provision to deliver. Although the planning approach set out is essentially local, patterns of regional and national specialisms have been established. The bill makes it clear that when a course for 16-19 year-olds leads to an external qualification, LSC funds can only be used for programs that lead to approved qualifications. A welcome new focus is on seeking learner feedback. (Contains 37 notes.) (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 438 445

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S Bourne
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

feda quality learning skills

feda comments

The Learning and Skills sector: the emerging agenda

1. The shape and operation of the new Learning and Skills sector is beginning to emerge, with the publication of the Bill, the Explanatory Notes, the Prospectus and the consultation paper on Post-16 Funding and Allocations. The agenda for future discussion is also becoming clearer. This paper is not a summary of the proposals: it provides an initial analysis of the major issues for debate. Further commentaries will be prepared as proposals are clarified; these are signalled at the end of this paper.

The scope of the new sector

2. The greater diversity of the new sector and the shape of the 'fair and competitive market' heralded in *Learning to succeed* are becoming clearer. Colleges, private training providers, schools sixth forms and voluntary and community providers will be funded on a broadly common basis,[1] irrespective of whether they are public, private or charitable bodies. The driving concern will be the needs of customers, not the interests of the providers. We welcome the focus on learners and the removal of artificial distinctions between providers.

An important role for voluntary and community providers

3. The role of voluntary and community providers in the new arrangements is clearly seen as particularly significant in engaging local communities more appropriately, and is consistent with the Prime Minister's view of the importance of this sector:

> *Voluntary and community groups, as independent, not-for-profit organisations, bring distinctive value to society and fulfil a role that is distinct from both the State and the market. They enable individuals to contribute to public life and the development of their communities by providing the opportunity for voluntary action.*[2]

A refreshed sector

4. It is also intended that the new system 'will be regularly refreshed by new talent'.[3] This process of refreshment is described as necessary to meet the needs of the 'fast-moving knowledge-based economy in the next century'.[4] However, the need for this to be achieved through product innovation by existing providers is not emphasised.

CE 079 253

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A role for employers

5. The Learning and Skills Council (LSC), it is stated, will open up funding for voluntary and community bodies as well as organisations from outside education. There is a duty placed on the LSC to 'encourage employers to participate in the provision of post-16 education and training'[5] so employers offering training provision will be one group of new providers. Clarification is needed about whether it is intended that provision made by employers should be only for their own employees, or whether they will be encouraged to offer training more widely.

6. Given the recognised need to encourage companies to invest in training, care will need to be taken that this does not lead to employers being able to claim public funding for provision which has previously been offered at their own expense. This would conflict with the duty in the same clause of the Bill to 'encourage employers to contribute to the costs of post-16 education and training'.

7. Another category of new provider will be encouraged through the lifting of the bar on the creation of LEA-maintained 16–19 institutions. This is discussed in more detail below.

A particular role for the public sector?

8. An important question is whether public sector providers should be recognised as having a particular role. There is a view that large public sector providers have the capacity to make a distinctive contribution. Large colleges, for example, have the capacity to run and/or host staff and curriculum development, provide access to facilities and systems, carry out research and development and lead on innovation, which could be of benefit to other providers. If charged with such a role, within a clear framework, this could ensure the sector benefits as a whole from the particular strengths of large public sector enterprises.

Innovation with stability

9. As well as presenting the sector as undergoing constant renewal, recent publications also give welcome recognition to the need for stability. Continuity of providers will support quality and ease planning as well as supporting the development of strong collaborative partnerships. Regular introduction of new providers is unlikely to be sustained without failure of others, suggesting turbulence and lack of continuity in the sector. In order to be responsive, the system cannot rely on new providers as the only source of innovation and new provision. Existing providers should be the principle source of innovation.

16–19 provision

10. The Bill lifts the bar on the creation of 16–19 institutions maintained by LEAs[6] which resulted from the 1992 Act. As a result of the new legislation, 'LEAs may establish and maintain secondary schools that provide full-time education for 16–19-year-olds without providing education for children of compulsory school age'.[7] The Prospectus states that these institutions can be proposed by 'LEAs and other promoters'.[8] Speculation regarding who these other promoters might be has centred on the possibility of consortia of schools or other partnerships wishing to establish new provision. The possibility that this could be a means of addressing rationalisation of small school sixth forms has also been suggested.

11. The rationale behind these changes is not clearly spelt out, although they fit within the general commitment to introduce new providers. It is described as 'an important additional means for local communities to raise standards and provide the choices and curriculum breadth young people need and want'.[9]

12. In the Prospectus the change is explained as follows:

> *We also want to encourage new forms of provision to meet the needs of young people and to ensure that patterns of provision best serve local needs ... These arrangements will put in the hands of local communities options for raising standards and providing the choices and curriculum breadth that young people need.*[10]

13. These extracts both emphasise the needs of the community and the need for choices and curriculum breadth. However, they may equally reflect government concern about the quality of 16–19 provision in schools and colleges where the needs of 16–19-year-olds are not the exclusive concern, and a desire to separate out the provision for young people and adults.

14. It is questionable whether this opening up of the market for 16–19 providers will in fact deliver choices and curriculum breadth. 16–19 institutions have in the main, with few but notable exceptions, offered A-level provision and do not offer the breadth of opportunities signalled through *Qualifying for success*. These proposals set out the potential for young people to follow broader programmes combining academic and vocational programmes with key skills. This could help promote take-up of broader and more applied programmes suited to the future skill needs of the economy.

15. Bodies such as FEDA have argued that this potential should be translated into a clear specification of the range of opportunities that all 16–19-year-olds should be entitled to access. This would help to make a reality of the *Qualifying for success* opportunities.

16. In the absence of a clear statement of entitlement to a range of provision, there is a danger of a selective system emerging. Academically able 16–19-year-olds are likely to stay in school or go to sixth form centres or sixth form colleges, while those more suited to GNVQs or vocationally oriented provision will go to FE colleges. Therefore the vision of greater breadth in 16–19 provision, defined as a mix of types of programmes (GNVQs, A-levels and vocational units), may be undermined.

17. This scenario could lead to colleges developing as what have been described as 'tertiary modern' providers for this age group. This possibility is reinforced by the pattern of 14–16 provision in colleges described in the Explanatory Notes.[11] These make it clear that 14–16-year-olds in colleges will mainly be young people who have had part of the National Curriculum disapplied, are excluded or being home educated, or suited to more work-related learning. The clear powers in the Bill for this provision in colleges to be funded are very welcome. However, the dangers of creating a selective system at 16 must not be ignored.

18. There is a danger therefore that these proposals will not necessarily deliver the choices and curriculum breadth anticipated. Particular attention should be paid to ensuring either that breadth of provision in 16–19 institutions is secured, or that young people are enabled to follow programmes in more than one institution. Current funding arrangements make this difficult. Proposals may also create a clearer break at 16 although this should be moderated by the role of the Youth Support Service operating 13–19.

19. The Learning and Skills Council also creates the possibility that distinctive curriculum requirements, backed by the Council's committee structure could lead to a more abrupt break in provision at 19. This may create particular difficulties for progression for young people at 19 and could also signal increasing difficulties for colleges offering all-age provision, as well as introducing the possibility of age segregation. If age-segregated provision is an intended objective, the evidence base for such a shift is not referenced in any of the Government's publications.

20. The Prospectus says little about work-based training for young people although the consultation on Post-16 Funding and Allocations underlines the role that it will play:

> *In the same way that 16–19-year-olds who wish to study full-time can expect to find a place in a school sixth form or a college, they should also be able to access the alternative of work-based learning.*[12]

21. Proposals for the funding of work-based learning for young people are promised for May 2000.

Local Learning Partnerships

22. The role of local Learning Partnerships (LLPs) appears to be strengthened in the latest reports. This is welcome, given their potential for reflecting the needs of the local community. LSCs are required to consult with LLPs in drawing up their plans, therefore LLPs should be influential in determining local need and the pattern of provision locally. In particular, LLPs are described as being the source of local community intelligence:

> *Their advice ought to assist the local LSC to ensure that learning opportunities match or anticipate the aspirations of the local community by judging the needs of individuals and employers and promoting collaboration. They are expected to help develop local economic prosperity and social cohesion by contributing to regeneration, capacity building and community development.*[13]

23. There is some scepticism in existing partnerships about their capacity to develop influential roles. In order for the potential role of LLPs as the voice of the local community to be realised, appropriate funding and support needs to be available to enable an effective infrastructure to be developed.

24. Despite uncertainty about the extent of their influence, all providers should have a role in their partnership. Already there are indications that small private training providers are concerned about having their voices heard within the partnerships and voluntary and community providers are not always involved. There is a very clear commitment in new arrangements to encouraging diverse and new providers, so LSCs are likely to be concerned that large providers do not dominate to the detriment of other, smaller providers.

25. There is a possible danger that LSCs could see the LLPs as an area for potential conflict rather than as a source of advice and support. The development of this relationship will therefore

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

be extremely important. The period up to the formation of LSCs is a valuable period for Learning Partnerships to establish themselves as effective bodies with the confidence of their members and of their community. This period provides an opportunity to evaluate their effectiveness and to consider, for example, whether funding is adequate and whether their existing boundaries are suitable. Further consideration may be needed as to whether they are sufficiently local to perform the capacity-building brief suggested in the Prospectus.

College companies

26. The Bill restricts the power of FE corporations to set up companies for the purpose of providing education or training. College companies have been established since incorporation for two main categories of activity. First they have been used as a tax planning mechanism, particularly in relation to income-generating training. Private company status for this activity allows colleges to minimise their VAT liability and bring it closer to the position of private training providers (VAT-registered limited companies). It also makes it easier for them to employ staff on terms and conditions more akin to those in the private sector when offering full-cost training.

27. The other common activity carried out through private companies has been the setting up of joint venture companies with other public and private sector organisations. Examples include the establishment of Learning World in Gateshead, a celebrated early precursor of UfI, which was set up under a joint venture company between the University of Sunderland and Gateshead College. Significant partnership initiatives of this kind cannot rely on trust and goodwill, but need to be established on a solid legal and financial footing.

28. The motivations for this new legislation are implied rather than clearly stated in the documents. The Explanatory Notes state that: 'this [i.e. education and training] is the responsibility of the FE corporation.'[14] This suggests that if education is the core business of the corporation then it should not be necessary to establish a company for its delivery.

29. It also appears that this change is being introduced as a result of concerns about franchising, and a desire that clarity about funding streams should not be muddied by unnecessary intermediary roles. The consultation on funding and allocations makes this clear:

> *Partnership arrangements are welcome but not the type of sub-contracting and franchising by further education colleges and private training providers which has involved a long chain of sub-contractors and where money for learners has therefore been diverted into overheads.*[15]

30. The commitment to shorten lines of accountability and avoid intermediaries is welcome, but could be achieved without this restriction on college enterprise. A simple power for LSCs to approve proposals for the establishment of college companies would allow positive and innovative joint initiatives to continue. Moreover the impact of this restriction, to draw a clearer line between private and public sector activity, is discordant with the Government's intention to bring public and private sector provision into closer partnership. The implications of this clause in the legislation should be carefully explored and the proposals reconsidered.

31. The issues discussed above raise questions about how the Learning and Skills proposals fit with broader government policy. The *Modernising Government* agenda points clearly towards a blurring of public and private provision, introduces the Best Value or Best Supplier arrangements for local authority services and further develops concepts of public–private partnership. Some of these aspects are clearly visible in the Learning and Skills proposals, but the longer-term implications are difficult to read. FEFC and FEDA are exploring these implications in joint policy work.

Relationships between organisations

32. The balance of power between different organisations is becoming clearer, although relationships appear complex and the requirements for liaison and consultation between agencies are likely to be burdensome. Although the Prospectus states that local authorities 'will have a greater strategic influence over post-16 learning in their local areas than is currently the case',[16] the Bill makes it clear that in relation to adult and community education, LEAs are required to secure provision specified by the LSC:

> *... the Secretary of State may direct the LEA to secure provision ... The LEA must comply provided it is given the necessary resources.*

33. However, with respect to sixth form provision, the position is less clear. Although the Government has decided that the LSC should fund LEAs for

their sixth form provision, LEAs 'would continue to make the allocation decisions for each school, and would retain their power to provide additional funding to schools if they so wish'.[17] Together with a commitment to maintaining school sixth forms' funding levels in real terms, schools have arguably secured comfortable transition arrangements relative to other providers.

34. Liaison and consultation with RDAs is laid out in some detail in the Prospectus. Because of the RDAs' responsibilities in relation to regional skills strategies, harmonisation of proposals will be vital. Arrangements highlighted include requirements on the LSCs to:

    - Involve RDA representatives on national and local councils
    - Consult with the RDAs in drawing up plans
    - Have the support of the RDA for local LSC plans before they are approved.[18]

35. In practice, the danger is that the level of iteration required between regional plans and local plans could be time-consuming and impede the capacity to develop effective provision.

36. The Prospectus refers to the importance of the Employment Service (ES) and the LSC working together to ensure that funding systems are consistent and use common audit and payment arrangements where possible. This is very welcome to providers who are funded by both bodies. The fact that the funding consultation document covers ES- and LSC-funded provision is also helpful.

37. Although the latest publications suggest some clarifications, the number of organisations with whom LSC and its local arms will need to consult and collaborate on a regular basis provides a daunting list: the Small Business Service (SBS), Youth Support Service (YSS), University for Industry, Learning Partnerships, Regional Development Agencies (RDAs), Government Offices, National Training Organisations, Employment Services (ES), Disability and Equal Opportunities bodies, among others. The cost in terms of officer time to provide cross-representation on committees and the capacity for this liaison to slow decision-making remain areas of concern.

Planning and allocations

The role of local LSCs

38. The LSCs will have a very significant role in shaping provision in their areas. For example they will be responsible for:

    - Discussing and agreeing the plans for individual FE colleges and training providers
    - Developing the local provider infrastructure and managing the learning market and promoting the demand for skills and lifelong learning needed locally, nationally and by sector
    - Driving up quality and standards in all post-16 learning, using funding to support quality improvements and encourage innovation
    - Integrating the LSC's activities with local economic development and regeneration activities.[19]

Area-based planning

39. These responsibilities mark a significant shift towards more area-based planning and coordination of provision.

40. Increased planning and coordination is envisaged of provision for 14–19-year-olds. The Secretary of State has new powers to 'secure the provision of services which he thinks will encourage, enable or assist (directly or indirectly) effective participation by young persons in education and training'.[20] The Bill[21] also imposes a duty on relevant bodies to coordinate their own activities with the Youth Support Service (YSS) in their areas. The Explanatory Notes reassure that 'such duties will not require the bodies to take action which would significantly interfere with the efficient or effective exercise of their own functions.'[22] The source of the funding for 14–16 provision, which is not within the converging funding streams from TECs and FEFC, is not dealt with in the documentation to date.

41. Area-based inspection for 16–19-year-olds is also concerned with the whole provision in an area – 'the focus will be on the quality of what is provided in the area as a whole'.[23] Action plans following these inspections are drawn up by the LEAs and local LSCs, emphasising the focus on planning provision across an area, rather than the role of individual providers in isolation.

Quality and planning

42. LSCs will be clearly responsible therefore for developing their provider infrastructure. For example:

    > *Local LSCs will work within the overall framework to build a network of well-managed and innovative providers, capable of identifying and responding to the needs of learners and employers, and will reward providers who are successful in these respects.*[24]

43. LSCs will have the power, this suggests, to shift provision according to particular criteria. A key criterion is likely to be quality. In order to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

determine those organisations fit to receive public funding, the LSC will establish quality criteria. The Prospectus signals a convergence agenda towards these national quality standards. In order to allow new providers into the market, short-term concessions will be made on quality standards, and it will be the responsibility of the LSCs to support providers in reaching the appropriate standard:

> *Those which are still striving to reach the standards can expect a greater degree of support and involvement than they may be experiencing currently. Over time, the LSC will fund only those providers which meet the standards it expects.*[25]

44. Quality will become the key focus in the new sector, with clear intentions to link expansion to excellence where this does not disrupt the range of provision. The paper on funding and allocation seeks views on 'how far quality should be taken into account in allocations.'[26] This follows a clear proposal in *Learning to succeed* that expansion should be linked to quality. The Funding and Allocations consultation paper states that:

> *Those offering high quality provision, who can demonstrate that they can meet extra demand in the subject or occupational areas where they have a good track record, must have opportunities to expand.*[27]

45. The quality of a learner's experience can be determined by facilities such as learning centres and catering, or the range of curriculum opportunities that are accessible, as well as the quality of teaching in the subject or occupational area. The contribution of these different elements of quality to the overall learner experience will need to be taken into account in decisions about expansion based on quality.

A demand-led or a planning-led system

46. The implication is that demand will be managed or mediated though the role of LSCs, not through direct interaction between providers and customers. This ambiguity is illustrated in the following extract:

> *The LSC's planning system will be customer-led, not provider-driven. That means the system, both planning and funding, will be driven by needs, not by central design nor by pre-ordained funding routes. The LSC's planning will be steered by a thorough assessment of national, regional, sectoral and local priorities, with SBS, NTOs, Ufi, RDAs, the new support service for young people and local Learning Partnerships all helping to inform the LSC's plans.*[28]

47. The model envisaged appears to give the LSCs the role of assessing needs, generating a plan to meet those needs and then contracting provision to deliver. The tension between a planned model and a demand-led approach has been explored through a joint IPPR–FEDA seminar series entitled *The new learning market*, the report of which is due to be published shortly. This work raised concerns about whether the system will be sufficiently responsive to demand or whether planning processes could confound normal market activity.

48. The indications are that the process of allocating resources is likely to be significantly different to the system currently operated by FEFC, and may be closer in some respects to the TEC model, but based on a national tariff and without the same local discretion. The FEFC approach essentially provides colleges with a block grant against targets for overall provision. Although specific funds are allocated to support growth in targeted areas (for example, full-time provision for 16–19-year-olds and widening participation), these are often a relatively small proportion of the total allocation. Colleges are otherwise able to use significant powers of virement.

49. The implication of a system which invests significant resources in assessing the needs of individuals and employers and generating detailed plans of skills needs is that the LSC will wish to purchase specific volumes and types of provision to meet these assessed needs. Therefore, a more substantial part of allocations may be hypothecated or earmarked for specific provision. The capacity for virement in the light of actual demand in such a system would be of vital interest.

50. A particular issue arising from this strong planning model relates to the extent to which these arrangements will encourage innovation and creativity, which is referred to as essential to the knowledge-driven economy, or whether it will breed institutions that are risk-averse and focussed on compliance.

Indicative allocations

51. There is much to welcome in the approach set out in the consultation paper in relation to the allocations process. It notes that in the FE sector 'stable relationships between providers and their

principal funding body have created the right conditions for expansion'[29] and contrasts this with the difficulties caused in other sectors by the annual contracting process. It proposes therefore that there should be scope for both the Employment Service and LSCs to give indicative allocations to any provider for up to three years. It also notes the desirability of giving reasonable notice of allocations to providers, proposing that provisional allocations are made in January for the year beginning in the following September. In both cases the paper acknowledges the need to retain sufficient flexibility to respond to changing demand.

52. While the thinking behind these proposals seems well intentioned and will represent a particular improvement for small providers, it may also indicate that the logic of a truly demand-driven system has not fully been assimilated. If provision is based on the pattern of learner demand then it is the capacity of institutions to forecast and respond to customer requirements which is their best guarantee of stability. Colleges and training providers might more appropriately be given the guarantee offered to school sixth forms – that there will be no reduction in funding as long as demand from customers does not reduce.[30]

Regional and national specialisms

53. The planning approach set out in the consultation papers is essentially local: the local LSC will determine how best to meet the needs of the individuals and employers in its local community. It will take note of the plans and capabilities of those providers in the local area through consultation with the local Learning Partnership.

54. In two instances the Funding and Allocations consultation paper recognises that this wholly local focus may be inappropriate. It proposes that a central coordination unit be set up to deal with national employers who wish to contract nationally[31] but in the same paragraph argues that 'there should be a presumption against national arrangements between the LSC and training providers'. The reason stated is that to do so might weaken responsiveness to local need.

55. When considering arrangements for the University for Industry, the consultation paper recognises that provision in one area might best be made by Ufi tutors from another area.[32] It proposes 'some form of pooling arrangements' to cope with such transfers and also contemplates a limited amount of national contracting.

56. There is a case for provision crossing Learning Partnership boundaries which goes far beyond the role of Ufi and national employers. Provision of vocational education and training, as opposed to academic study at this level, has established patterns of regional and national specialism. Some colleges, such as the land-based sector recruit substantially from outside their local area. Many training providers are organised on the basis of specialist areas of work rather than geography and most colleges have elements which reflect a regional role. There is a danger that groups of local providers in Learning Partnerships are not likely to reflect fully these specialist opportunities when advising local LSCs.

Beyond Schedule 2

57. The Bill[33] sets out the arrangements for determining what provision can be funded at public expense. This replaces Schedule 2 which currently governs those programmes that can be funded in colleges. The Bill makes it clear that for 16–19-year-olds, where a course leads to an external qualification, LSC funds can only be used for programmes which lead to approved qualifications. It can fund a wider range of programmes for adults, encompassing adult and community provision; however, money which 'can reasonably be said' to come from the LSC can only be used to fund examination and assessment fees for nationally approved qualifications. The implied need to be able to provide a clear audit of money that has come from the LSC and money which is from other sources will create significant challenges for providers, and will need to be supported with clear guidance on how to draw this distinction.

58. The Bill also delivers the promise outlined in *Learning to succeed* that 'a unitised system of external qualifications'[34] will be funded for adults. The power to fund units and the power to fund provision other than qualification-bearing programmes will be welcome in enabling providers to respond more effectively to need. However, there is a danger of losing progression pathways or clear connections between national qualifications and non-qualification bearing programmes. The Prospectus recognises this danger:

> *Whilst qualifications are very important and accreditation will continue to be appropriate for the majority of courses, we also want to see the LSC provide opportunities with scope for learners to gain recognition for their achievements, other than through qualifications.*[35]

59. An urgent role for the LSC will be to develop ways of recognising achievements which do not lead to national qualifications, in order that non-qualification bearing provision can provide effective progression to national qualifications. FEDA is undertaking development work building on its earlier work on learning outcomes, and is publishing papers on adult achievement jointly with NIACE.

60. The Post-16 Funding and Allocations paper[36] sets out the arrangements for funding adult and community learning under the LSC. The paper sets out the enormous discrepancy in levels of funding currently ranging from 50p to £24·50 per head, but proposes that this should continue for two years under the LSC:

> *We guarantee that each LEA will receive funding, in the first two years of the LSC's operation, at a level comparable with their net current spend on adult education in the their education budgets.*

61. This proposal appears to prolong inequities in the levels of provision. A clear timescale for convergence of the level of provision nationally should be a requirement on the LSC.

New focus on learner feedback

62. There is a welcome new focus on seeking learner feedback, making this a specific function for the LSCs and Learning Partnerships:

> *Local Learning Partnerships will have an important new role in establishing mechanisms to enable feedback from learners to have a real influence on the quality of future provision.*[37]

63. Feedback and complaints procedures and the information they provide will be made public. Area inspections too are charged to consider 'learner reaction' to provision.

64. A focus on learner satisfaction could be a significant means of ensuring that the system is demand driven, and could counter fears that the Government's concern to meet the skills needs of employers may lead to learners being encouraged to follow particular types of programme. A strong system of learner feedback informing the LSC's quality improvement activity, will provide an important counter-balance to complement data, for example on achievement, which is easier to collect but may be a poor indicator of quality.

Forthcoming FEDA papers on Learning and Skills

This paper provides an initial analysis of emerging issues. It does not specifically address issues of funding and quality since these are the subject of specific consultations. FEDA will analyse and respond to consultation papers and reports as these emerge. The following papers will be published in addition to regular commentary through *Briefing*, FEDA's monthly newsletter:

Funding and allocations
FEDA response to the first technical consultation paper.

The new learning market
A joint IPPR–FEDA publication.

Provisions for learners with learning difficulties and disabilities

Quality arrangements

Meeting the needs of employers

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notes

1. *Learning to succeed*, paragraph 4·6
2. *Compact between Government and the voluntary sector* published by the Home Office, November 1999
3. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·24
4. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·24
5. *Learning and skills Bill*, clause 4
6. *Bill*, clause 96
7. *Explanatory notes*, paragraph 135
8. *Prospectus*, paragraph 4·13
9. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 4·3
10. *Prospectus*, paragraph 4·13
11. *Explanatory notes*, paragraph 157
12. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 3·4
13. *Prospectus*, paragraph 2·44
14. *Explanatory notes*, paragraph 177
15. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·30
16. *Prospectus*, paragraph 2·41
17. *Explanatory notes*, paragraph 45
18. *Prospectus*, paragraph 2·38–9
19. *Prospectus*, box on pages 16–17
20. *Bill*, clause 99
21. *Bill*, clause 100
22. *Explanatory notes*, paragraph 144
23. *Prospectus*, box on page 46
24. *Prospectus*, paragraph 5·7
25. *Prospectus*, paragraph 5·6
26. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·21
27. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·21
28. *Prospectus*, paragraph 3·2
29. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·22
30. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 4·4
31. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·34
32. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraph 2·28
33. *Bill*, clause 85–92
34. *Explanatory notes*, clause 124
35. *Prospectus*, paragraph 5·27
36. *Post-16 funding and allocations*, paragraphs 3·12–13
37. *Prospectus*, paragraph 2·47

Web references

The publications referred to in this paper can be found at the following websites:

The learning and skills Bill and explanatory notes
http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/pabills.htm

The Learning and Skills Council prospectus
http://www.dfee.gov.uk/post16/index.shtml

Post-16 funding and allocations: first technical consultation paper
http://www.dfee.gov.uk/post16/br_fund.shtm

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Further information

For further information, or to respond to points made in this paper, please contact:
Caroline Mager, Manager, FEDA policy unit,
Citadel Place, Tinworth Street, London SE11 5EH
Tel: 0207 840 5329 Fax: 0207 840 5401
e-mail: cmager@feda.ac.uk

Additional copies

Additional copies are available from:
FEDA publications, Citadel Place,
Tinworth Street, London SE11 5EH
Tel: 0207 840 5302/4 Fax: 0207 840 5401
e-mail: publications@feda.ac.uk

www.feda.ac.uk

This publication is available as a free download from FEDA's website at: www.feda.ac.uk (requires Adobe Acrobat Reader, available free from www.adobe.com).

Published by FEDA | Feedback should be sent to FEDA publications, Citadel Place, Tinworth Street, London SE11 5EH | Tel: 0207 840 5302/4 | Fax: 0207 840 5401 | e-mail: publications@feda.ac.uk | Registered with the Charity Commissioners | Editor: Huw Jones | Designer: Dave Shaw | ISBN 1 85338 532 8 | © 2000 FEDA. All rights reserved